

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
YESSUH SUHYES HUSSEY,

Plaintiff,

-against-

HIGH SCHOOL – GEORGE WESTING-HOUSE
VOC & TECH HIGH SCHOOL; and THE NEW
YORK STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Defendants.

-----X
PAMELA K. CHEN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Yessuh Suhyes Hussey, currently held at the Anna M. Kross Center on Rikers Island, brings this *pro se* action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 is granted. For the reasons discussed below, the complaint is dismissed.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that George Westinghouse High School, the New York City public high school that Plaintiff attended from 2010 to 2014, did not print out his class grades for 2014, nor the additional certificate he received for his three-year electrical Career and Technical Education. (Dkt. 1 (“Compl.”), at 4.) As a remedy, Plaintiff seeks to require defendants “to release all my high school achievement data.” (*Id.* at 5.)

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A complaint must plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A claim is plausible “when the plaintiff

¹ Plaintiff filed eight complaints on the same day.

pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Matson v. Bd. of Educ.*, 631 F.3d 57, 63 (2d Cir. 2011) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)). Although all allegations contained in the complaint are assumed to be true, this tenet is “inapplicable to legal conclusions.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. In reviewing a *pro se* complaint, the court must be mindful that a plaintiff’s pleadings should be held “to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104–105 (1976)); see *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009) (noting that even after *Twombly*, the court “remain[s] obligated to construe a *pro se* complaint liberally”).

Nevertheless, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), a district court shall dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action where it is satisfied that the action “(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” Similarly, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, a district court “shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

DISCUSSION

To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that defendants violated plaintiff’s federal rights while acting under color of state law. 42 U.S.C. § 1983; see also *Washington v. County of Rockland*, 373 F.3d 310, 315 (2d Cir. 2004). Here, Plaintiff’s allegations do not rise to the level of a constitutional violation as Plaintiff fails to allege any substantive factual allegations in support of any claims of violations of the Constitution or federal statutes.

DENIAL OF LEAVE TO AMEND

The Second Circuit has held that leave to replead should be liberally granted to *pro se* litigants. *See Grullon v. City of New Haven*, 720 F.3d 133, 140 (2d Cir. 2013) (“[A] *pro se* complaint generally should not be dismissed without granting the plaintiff leave to amend at least once. . . .”); *see also Chavis v. Chappius*, 618 F.3d 162, 170 (2d Cir. 2010). “[B]ut amendment should be denied where the complaint gives no ‘indication that a valid claim might be stated.’” *McKie v. Kornegay*, No. 21-1943, 2022 WL 4241355, *3 (2d Cir. Sept. 15, 2022) (quoting *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000)). Here, the Court concludes that granting leave to amend would be futile and declines to do so.

FILING INJUNCTION WARNING

The federal courts have limited resources. Frequent frivolous filings work to diminish the ability of the courts to manage their dockets for the efficient administration of justice. “The district courts have the power and the obligation to protect the public and the efficient administration of justice from individuals who have a history of litigation entailing vexation, harassment and needless expense to other parties and an unnecessary burden on the courts and their supporting personnel.” *Lau v. Meddaugh*, 229 F.3d 121, 123 (2d Cir. 2000) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

As previously noted, Plaintiff filed this Complaint along with eight (8) others on the same day. The Court is also in receipt, as of February 16, 2023, of forty-three (43) additional complaints filed by Plaintiff. Plaintiff is therefore warned that the future filing of vexatious and frivolous litigation may result in sanctions, including the imposition of an injunction prohibiting him from making future filings seeking *in forma pauperis* status without leave of the Court. *See*

In re Sassower, 20 F.3d 42, 44 (2d Cir. 1994) (“With respect to civil litigation, courts have recognized that the normal opportunity to initiate lawsuits may be limited once a litigant has demonstrated a clear pattern of abusing the litigation process by filing vexatious and frivolous complaints.”).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B), 1915A. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment, close this case, and mail a copy of this Memorandum & Order to Plaintiff. The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for purpose of an appeal. *Coppedge v. United States*, 269 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Pamela K. Chen
PAMELA K. CHEN
United States District Judge

Dated: March 13, 2023
Brooklyn, New York